



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,091	07/08/2003	Chang-nyeun Kim	1572.1102	8368
21171	7590	07/05/2005		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER TANNER, HARRY B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/614,091

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Harry B. Tanner

Art Unit

3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-31 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-13 and 24-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 31 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance: See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claims 14-23 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 11/2/04.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 24-27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese reference 2001-091143 in view of Rivalto. Japanese reference 2001-091143 discloses a refrigerator having a cooling compartment, memory means for storing the health condition of users and information on food stored in the compartment in which a controller can search the database and display the food that is related to the current user and his health condition. It is inherent in the Japanese reference 2001-091143 system that a user recognition device is provided in order for the controller to determine the stored food appropriate for the user and that the system also includes an means for inputting the user health condition. Rivalto teaches the use of a biometric input device such as an iris scanner in order to recognize the user of a storage device (see col. 3, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of the Japanese reference such that it included the use of an iris scanner in order to recognize the user of the refrigerator in view of the teachings of Rivalto.

Claims 10-13 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese reference 2001-091143 in view of Rivalto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Maeda. Maeda teaches the use of a bar code scanner in order to track the input and removal of food from a refrigerator and recording how long the food has been in the refrigerator. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of the Japanese reference such that it included the use of a bar code scanner in order to track the input and removal of food from a refrigerator and recording how long the food has been in the refrigerator in view of the teachings of Maeda.

Claims 8 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's arguments filed 4/19/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example, with respect to applicant's contention that there is no suggestion to combine the Japanese reference and the Rivalto reference, it is pointed out that the test for obviousness is not what the references expressly suggest but what the disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is the examiner position that the Japanese reference clearly calls for some way to indicate to the information processor which person is being referenced with respect to health condition and favorite food items. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a device that can indicate to an information processor which person is taking items out of a storage system by using biometric technology as

Art Unit: 3744

taught by Rivalto to identify that person to the information processor of the Japanese reference.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry B. Tanner whose telephone number is (571) 272-4813. The examiner can normally be reached 8:30 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler, can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Harry B. Tanner". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "H" and a cursive "B. Tanner".

Harry B. Tanner
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3744